

EDWARD "COACH" WEINHAUS, ESQ.
LegalSolved LLC
CA BAR #330344, Licensed before C.D.Cal.
11500 Olive Blvd. Suite 133
Creve Coeur, MO. 63141
Telephone: 314-580-9580
E-mail: eaweinhaus@gmail.com

Plaintiff in Pro Per

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

EDWARD "COACH" WEINHAUS,

Plaintiff,

v.

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-00262 JFW (ASx)

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE
COURT'S ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE ECF #38**

Judge:	John F. Walter
Mag. Judge:	Alka Sagar
Crtrm.:	7A
Trial Date:	Not Set

1 Plaintiff sincerely apologizes for the failure to file the Joint Report as required
2 by the Court's Order dated April 8, 2025 (Docket No. 23). This oversight was
3 unintentional having first filed to stay the conference and then attempting to arrange,
4 in good faith, an immediate conference thereafter. ECF # 27 (filed 5/15/25). The
5 Court rejected ECF #27 in ECF #29, where the Court listed "no showing of good
6 cause." Several minutes after the Court's ruling, Plaintiff emailed Defendant to
7 arrange to speak to Defendant the following day (5/16/2025). Plaintiff called
8 Defendant the following day (5/16/25) at approximately 1:30 PM Pacific time.
9 Defendant's counsel informed Plaintiff that he would like to research the issue of
10 "Good Cause" and asked to be able to conference about it Tuesday May 20, 2025.
11 Plaintiff agreed to wait for Defendant's counsel's research and otherwise conduct
12 the conference.

13 After Defendant conceded the "good cause" issue on May 20, 2025, the
14 parties conducted a good faith conference at that time. Defendants sent Plaintiffs
15 their draft on the same evening (5/20/25). Plaintiffs inserted its position and edits the
16 same evening (5/20/25). Defendants sent their next edited version back after hours
17 on May 22, 2025. Plaintiff responded with his edits on May 23, 2025, the same day
18 as the Order to Show Cause was entered. Defendants filed the joint conference
19 report on 5/23/25 shortly after the Order to Show Cause was entered. ECF #39.

20 Plaintiff at all times sought to diligently proceed with the conference, confer
21 and respond to Defendant's counsel. Further, Plaintiff was the driver beyond

1 moving the process forward after the Court’s rejection of the request to stay the
2 conference. The burden of the Court’s proposed resolution – dismissal of Plaintiff’s
3 claims – only falls on one party, who was diligently pressing forward. Nothing in
4 this suggests that Defendant was not acting in good faith. But rather, the four
5 business day delays in responses were manifestly the result of Plaintiff offering
6 Defendant’s counsel professional courtesy, and were in no way intended to
7 disrespect the Court and its deadlines.

8
9 Plaintiff and Defendant have taken immediate steps to ensure compliance
10 with Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 26-1. The Joint
11 Report has been submitted, prior to the submission of this Response to the Order to
12 Show Cause. ECF #39. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court not dismiss this
13 action and find that Plaintiff’s efforts and Defendant’s presumably further claims of
14 acting in good faith represent Good Cause. Please advise if any further information
15 or action is required.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Dated: May 27, 2025

Plaintiff in Pro Per

23
24 By: /s/Edward “Coach” Weinhaus/s/
25 EDWARD “COACH” WEINHAUS, ESQ
26 Plaintiff
27 CA BAR# 330344
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Edward “Coach” Weinhaus, certify that on May 27, 2025, I served a copy of this filing on all parties or their counsel of record via CM/ECF addressed as follows:

Matt Burris | Attorney
matt.burris@quarles.com | D. 619-243-0892
Quarles & Brady LLP
101 West Broadway, Suite 1500
San Diego, CA 92101

/s/Edward “Coach” Weinhaus/s/
EDWARD “COACH” WEINHAUS, ESQ Plaintiff
CA BAR# 330344